<center>**REMARKS**</center>

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. By this amendment, the specification and claims 1, 11, 13, 19 and 23-28 are amended. Claims 5 and 17 are canceled. Hence, claims 1-4, 6-16 and 18-30 are pending in this application. The amendments to the claims do not add any new matter to this application. Furthermore, the amendments to the claims were made to improve the readability and clarity of the claims and not for any reason related to patentability. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed February 6, 2008 are addressed hereinafter.

I. ISSUES NOT RELATING TO PRIOR ART

<center>A. CLAIMS - U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH</center>

<center>CLAIMS 13-18</center>

The Office Action states that claims 13-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants believe that the rejection is fully addressed by amended claim 13.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

<center>B. CLAIMS - U.S.C. § 101</center>

<center>CLAIMS 13-18</center>

The Office Action states that claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action asserts that "claim 13-18 are non-statutory because are directed towards software, per se, lacking storage on a medium, which enables any underlying functionality to occur." (Office Action, page 3) This is incorrect.

The disclosure includes FIG. 4 and the specification describes the elements in the computer system 100 depicted in FIG. 4. Paragraph [0037] of the specification states, "FIG. 4 is a block diagram that illustrates a generic network device (for example a network access device or

an end-user device) upon which an embodiment of the invention may be implemented. **The device** may be **any computer device** requiring or providing access to a network including, but not limited to, a router, firewall, switch, VPN concentrator, desktop or laptop **computer**, a personal digital assistant (PDA), or a cell phone or other embedded device. **Device 100** includes a **bus 102** or other communication mechanism for communicating information, and **a processor 104** coupled with **bus 102** for processing information. **Computer system 100** also includes a **main memory 106**, such as a random access memory ("RAM") or other dynamic storage device, coupled to **bus 102** for storing information and instructions to be executed by **processor 104**." (Emphasis added.)

Therefore, the network device in claim 13 may be **computer system 100** and the means may include, for example, not only **main memory 106** with programmed instructions, but also **processor 104** and **bus 102**. Further, according to the paragraph [0037] of the specification, claims 13-18 can be reasonably interpreted in one embodiment as a system of computer hardware that operates according to stored instructions.

In addition, claim 13 now recites "[a] network device, comprising: a network interface capable of being coupled to a computer network and for sending to the network access requests, a processor and a computer-readable storage medium having one or more stored sequences of instructions which, when executed, cause the processor to perform the steps of [...]." Therefore, claims 13-18 cannot be reasonably interpreted as a system of software "per se." Claim 13-18 may encompass a computer system, for example.

Thus, claims 13-18 are directed to statutory subject matter in the form of a machine or an article of manufacture.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

<center>CLAIMS 23-30</center>

The Office Action states that claims 23-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants believe that the rejection is fully addressed by amended specification and amended claims 23-28.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II.   ISSUES RELATING TO ALLEGED PRIOR ART

<center>A. CLAIMS 1-30 —35 U.S.C. § 102(e): ANDERSEN</center>

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Andersen et al., U.S. Patent No. 7, 089, 316 (hereinafter "Andersen"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

<center>CLAIM 1</center>

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method of providing access to services across a computer network, comprising the step of:

> **generating an access request, said access request including a network device description** and a plurality of service requests indicative of computer services for which the network device requests provisioning;
>
> **wherein the device description includes one or more of a device vendor, device type, device version and physical location**; and
>
> forwarding said access request for authentication and authorization.

Claim 1 recites one or more features that are not taught or suggested by Andersen. For example, Andersen does not describe "**generating an access request, said access request including a network device description [...] wherein the device description includes one or more of a device vendor, device type, device version and physical location.**"

Andersen describes for deploying a resource over a content-specific session. (Andersen: Abstract) Andersen's resources include both non-client specific resources, such as a pay-per-view movie, downloadable audio content, etc., as well as client-specific resources, such as network accessible storage, etc. (Andersen: column 3, lines 37-40) However, in Andersen, user's selections are limited to already predefined and pre-set resource options. Andersen's user selects a resource from the resources options, and not by providing a physical description of a resource s/he requests. Therefore, Andersen's user has no ability to **generate an access request [...] including one or more of a device vendor, device type, device version and physical location,** as claimed.

In Andersen, a client logs into the service provider using a service login identifier and a password. (Andersen: column 5, lines 38-40) The service user login identifier includes the order identifier and/or the resource identifier corresponding to the clients order and/or requested resource. (Andersen: column 5, lines 40-53) After a client requests a resource from a service provider, the service provider provisions the order, records the order in a data store, and creates a service login identifier containing attributes such as bandwidth. (Andersen: Abstract) For example, the bandwidth may correspond to client-specific resources, such as a movie or network accessible storage to which the client may store or backup data from the client's computer system. (Andersen: column 5, lines 65+; column 6, lines 1-2.)

Then, a determination is made as to whether the requested resource is available to the user, and if it is, the resource manager locates the requested resource such as a movie or a network accessible storage area. (Andersen: column 9, lines 11-20) However, if the requested resource is not available to the user, the resource-rejection message is sent to the user. (Andersen: column 9, lines 21-25)

In Andersen, a resource is unavailable to the user if the resource is not on the list of resources already predefined for the particular user. Such a list is predefined and stored on the server at the time when the user's service login identifier is created. (Andersen: column 9, lines 43-45) The service login identifier includes information about both the order identifier and the

resource identifier and it is stored in resource data store. The resource data includes a resource ID, a service login ID, a resource URL, and other attributes corresponding to the resource. The offering provider determines, based upon the response, whether the resource was set up and is available to the user. (Andersen: column 9, lines 56-61) However, Andersen does not allow a user to receive services for which the user has not been already provisioned or provided for. (Andersen: column 9, lines 57-61)

Neither does Andersen allow access to network devices by specifying a "**device vendor, device type, device version [or] physical location,**" as claimed.

Thus, claim 1 recites at least the above features that are not described in Andersen. Therefore, Andersen cannot anticipate claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 11, 13, 19 AND 23

Claims 11, 13, 19 and 23 recite features similar to those in claim 1. Therefore, applicants believe that claims 11, 13, 19 and 23 are patentable over Andersen for the same reasons discussed for claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The claims that are not discussed above depend directly or indirectly on the claims that have been discussed. Therefore, those claims are patentable for the reasons given above. In addition, each of the dependent claims separately introduces features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to expedite positive resolution of the examination, separate arguments are not provided for each of the dependent claims at this time.

III.   CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, all pending claims are in condition for allowance.   A petition for an extension of time is hereby made to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any applicable fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: April 06, 2008

/MalgorzataAKulczycka#50496/
Malgorzata A. Kulczycka
Reg. No. 50,496

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 414-1228
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076